

Adoption of Additional Chapters of the Accreditation Handbook August 2010

Overview of this Report

This report provides an update on the work to revise the *Accreditation Handbook* for discussion, input, and possible adoption. The item contains one chapter for action by the COA that was updated by staff to reflect the changes identified by COA members at the June 2010 meeting. The item also contains one chapter that is provided as information for the COA. This chapter was updated by staff to reflect the implementation of the revised accreditation system. Finally, the item contains a timeline that shows when each chapter was or should be brought to the COA for initial review, editing, and adoption.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the COA discuss and adopt the proposed changes to Chapter Fourteen: Evaluation of the Accreditation System. Staff, furthermore, recommends that the COA direct staff to post the adopted chapter.

Proposed Changes to Five Chapters of the Accreditation Handbook

During the May 2009 COA meeting, members and staff discussed the need to update the *Accreditation Handbook* to reflect the revised accreditation system. The COA directed staff to prepare one or more chapters for COA review and adoption at each subsequent meeting until the entire Handbook was updated and adopted.

At the June 2010 COA meeting, members reviewed and adopted the Introduction and Chapters Five, Six, and Twelve. The COA also identified edits to Chapter 14 and directed staff to bring Chapter 14, with tracked changes, to the August 2010 meeting for another review and possible adoption. The COA also directed staff to bring Chapter 13 to the August 2010 meeting for review and discussion.

Chapter Fourteen describes the accreditation system's evaluation processes and activities. This chapter is of interest to policymakers, institutional leadership, and BIR members because it describes how the COA holds itself accountable in a way that is similar to how the accreditation cycle holds program sponsors accountable. Chapter Thirteen discusses national accreditation organizations and the relationship between the activities and standards of those accrediting bodies and the Commission's accreditation cycle, and common and program standards.

Next Steps

Consistent with directions provided to staff at the May 2009 COA meeting, staff will continue to revise chapters in the *Accreditation Handbook* and will bring proposed revised chapters to the COA for its approval at future COA meetings.

Chapter ~~Twelve~~ Thirteen Articulation Between State and National Accreditation

Introduction

One of the objectives of the *Accreditation Framework* was to create a system of professional accreditation that enables institutions to reduce or eliminate redundancy between state and national reviews of the same programs. Institutions now have an option whereby state and national accreditation of an education unit can be accomplished in a single review that is based on the Common Standards. The national and the state accreditation teams and visits can be merged and the national accreditation of a credential program can substitute for the state review of that program. Central to the option is determination that the accreditation standards of the two entities are comparable. Current information can be found on the Commission's National Professional Organization Accreditation web page (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-alignment.html>)

The following elements of the *Accreditation Framework* govern articulation between national and state accreditation:

I. National Accreditation of an Education Unit

Upon the request of an institution, the accreditation of an education unit (school, college or department of education) by a national accrediting body will substitute for state accreditation under the Common Standards provided that the COA certifies to the CTC that the national accrediting entity fulfills the following conditions.

- A. The national accrediting entity agrees to use the Common Standards that have been adopted by the CTC or the national standards are deemed comparable by the COA.
- B. The accreditation process of the national entity includes on-site reviews.
- C. The team has co-leaders, one appointed according to state accreditation procedures and one appointed by the national accrediting body.
- D. The team members reviewing the Common Standards include members appointed by the national body and one or more California members selected according to state accreditation procedures.
- E. The review of all program documentation must be completed prior to the site visit, the preliminary findings on all programs will be available to the accreditation team, and the state team members will substantiate the preliminary findings at the visit.
- F. Accreditation teams represent ethnic and gender diversity, and include elementary and secondary school practitioners and postsecondary education members.
- G. The period of accreditation is consistent with a seven-year cycle and is compatible with the accreditation activities established by the state.
- H. The team develops a single report regarding all Common Standards and Program Standards which is submitted to the COA and the national accrediting body.

Implementation

Currently, the only national accrediting body which fits the description of the preceding two sections of the *Framework* is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE accreditation standards and the Common Standards have been judged as comparable, thus eliminating the need for a separate review of those standards by the state. Additionally, a joint state and national accreditation team and visit are scheduled for state and national accreditation under the Common Standards and the applicable Program Standards. This merging is accomplished through the Partnership Agreement between the CTC and NCATE. The following is the description of the status of the Partnership Agreement and the major features of the Partnership.

Partnership with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

Since 1988, the CTC and NCATE have had a "Joint Partnership Agreement." California institutions desiring joint or concurrent accreditation visits have been able to request such reviews during the past years. Presently, twenty-three (23) institutions in California are NCATE accredited and have CTC approval.

The COA approved the revised Protocol submission to NCATE in spring 2007. The Protocol was approved by the State Partnership board at its October 2007 meeting and is in effect through December 2014. The major elements of the Partnership Agreement between the COA and NCATE are as follows:

- California institutions are exempt from NCATE Program Review. California's Program Assessment process stands in lieu of the NCATE Program Review.
- All California visits will be joint visits.
- A single team will conduct the on-site accreditation visit. There will be co-chairs for the visit, one selected by NCATE and one selected by the Executive Director of the Commission.
- The team will have a total of 6 to 10 members depending on the size of the institution. The team will focus on both the Common Standards (NCATE Unit Standards) and the programs offered by the institution. Selected portions of the Common Standards will supplement the six NCATE Unit Standards.
- Team members will represent ethnic and gender diversity; and include elementary and secondary practitioners, and postsecondary education members.
- The team will prepare a single accreditation report including the findings of the NCATE Unit Standards, the selected portions of the Common Standards and Program Standards. The team will submit its report to the COA in the format approved by the COA. The NCATE report will be submitted to the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE. The COA and NCATE will make separate and independent accreditation decisions.
- The period of accreditation will be consistent with a seven-year cycle.

For more details on the Partnership Agreement (<http://www.ncate.org/documents/stateProtocols/CA/State%20Protocol.doc>), contact the CTC staff.

II. National Accreditation of a Credential Program

Upon the request of an institution, the accreditation of a credential program by a national accrediting entity will substitute for state review of the program provided that the COA certifies to the CTC that the national accreditation entity satisfies the following conditions.

1. The accrediting entity agrees to use the adopted California Program Standards for the specific credential under Option 1, or the standards used by the national entity are determined by the Committee to be equivalent to those adopted by the CTC under Option 1.
2. The accreditation team represents ethnic and gender diversity.
3. The accreditation team includes both postsecondary members and elementary and secondary school practitioners; a minimum of one voting member is from California.
4. The period of accreditation is consistent with a seven-year cycle and is compatible with the accreditation activities established by the state.
5. Nationally accredited credential programs participate in the unit accreditation process. The national accreditation of the program serves in lieu of the state's Program Assessment process.

Implementation

Under this provision of the *Accreditation Framework* an institution may request that accreditation by a national professional entity be substituted for the California's Program Assessment if the standards are deemed comparable and the national body meets the other requirements listed above.

In order to determine the comparability of national professional organization accreditation processes, the COA took action in the May 2008 to approve the following procedure:

1. The CTC must receive a request for the application for national professional organization standards alignment. This request can be submitted by an institution in preparation for its accreditation activities or can be from a national professional organization.
2. The institution or national professional organization submitting the request can choose to conduct the analysis of alignment and submit a preliminary alignment matrix for approval by the COA. This process is estimated to take between 3 and 6 months; or:
3. The institution or national professional organization submitting the request can request that the CTC convene a panel to develop an alignment matrix. When the request is submitted, it will be important for the request to identify upcoming accreditation activities that would utilize this alignment. This will serve to prioritize the requests for alignment to those that will actually be used for accreditation activities. This option could take up to one year to complete.

4. In accordance with its statutory responsibility to determine comparability of standards, COA would make a determination of comparability and, if satisfied, would approve the matrix. Or the COA may identify concepts or elements in the California standards that are missing in the national professional standards. The COA may choose to approve an alignment matrix that identifies these additional concepts and requires institutions to address the national professional standards AND the identified elements from the Commission's adopted standards.
5. Upon approval by the COA, the alignment matrix may be used by the institution to submit its response to the standards. The matrix will show where the response used for the national professional organization may be used, and where it will need to be supplemented to ensure that all aspects of the California standards are addressed.
6. Upon approval by the COA, the alignment matrix may be used by other institutions. An institution would notify the CTC of its desire to use national professional standards via its response to the preconditions. The matrix would no longer be valid at the time that there are adopted revisions to either the state standards or the national professional organizations.

III. Steps in the Process to 'Substitute' National Professional Accreditation for some part of the California Accreditation Process

Alignment of Standards--The first step in utilizing a national professional organization's accreditation in lieu of California's accreditation procedures is to complete an alignment study of the adopted California standards with the national professional organization's standards. The table below lists the national professional organizations for which the standards alignment has been completed or is in progress. If an institution or program sponsor is interested in working with an organization that is not listed, the process may be initiated by submitting a request (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-files/Application-N-P-O-S-A.doc>).

Alignment of Professional Organization's Accreditation Activities -The second step in utilizing a national professional organization's accreditation process is to conduct a study of the accreditation activities utilized by the professional accrediting organization. Once the study of the accreditation activities has been completed, the COA will make a determination of which, if any, of California's accreditation procedures may be waived or amended due to the organization's accreditation procedures.

Biennial Reports--interim reporting required by the organization **may** be utilized for some or all of the Biennial Reports, if the COA has determined that the interim reporting required by the national professional organization address the critical aspects of California's Biennial Reports.

Program Assessment—there are two options for institutions to select between related to professional accreditation of a educator preparation program by a national professional organization:

- a) The institution may elect to use the national professional standards in lieu of the Commission's adopted program standards in the CTC's Program Assessment process.
- b) If the COA has determined that the national professional organization's procedures address the critical aspects of California's Program Assessment process, the institution may elect to utilize the national professional accreditation in lieu of Program Assessment.

Site Visit--The CTC will be involved in site visits designed to assess the institution or program sponsor's institutional capacity to offer educator preparation programs. These visits focus on the CTC's Common Standards but information from the national professional organization's review could be considered instead of the Preliminary Findings from California's Program Assessment.

Chapter Fourteen

Evaluation of the Accreditation System

Introduction

This chapter provides information on how the Accreditation System ~~will be~~ is evaluated. The evaluation system is ~~designed to~~ parallel to the work done by institutions to meet Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Evaluation System. That is, data for each activity of the accreditation system ~~will have~~ data is collected, analyzed and used to make ongoing improvement. ~~Evaluation Results then inform the larger system. The r~~ Results of the analyses ~~will be~~ are reported to the Committee On Accreditation (COA) and, in some cases, are some of it ~~will be~~ included in the Annual Report presented to the Commission. In this way, evaluation ~~Results then~~ Results ~~then~~ inform the larger system. The data is ~~can also be used~~ available to provide input on policy issues and can be provided to researchers or other interested stakeholders.

For each major activity of the accreditation system, the following questions are asked: ~~Each part of the evaluation system is designed to answer one of the questions below:~~

1. How well is the activity being implemented?
2. Does the activity provide useful information for other activities in the system, and, in making accreditation decisions?
3. Is the activity serving the objectives of the accreditation system?

This chapter ~~will describes~~ when and how the evaluation system ~~by providing~~ operates to collect, analyze and report information pertinent to ~~about~~ each of the questions. This information is useful to the COA as it manages the accreditation system, to the CTC as it deliberates about policy related to the accreditation system, and to CTC staff responsible for administering the accreditation cycle. ~~proposed strategies for collecting data, analyzing the data and reporting information.~~

How well is the component activity being implemented?

Every component of the accreditation system has at least two training activities. For program sponsors, CTC staff present webcasts on preparing for Program Assessments, Biennial Reports, and site visits. For reviewers, there are several trainings; the initial Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) training occurs multiple times a year, follow-up training specific to particular roles at the site visits are held in the Fall, and preparation for reading documents (whether for Initial Program Review or for Program Assessment) and calibration training are provided just before the reading commences.

Technical assistance for program sponsors and follow-up trainings for BIR members are provided through workshops that are also webcasts. The benefit of webcasts is that they can be stored and viewed as needed by program sponsors. In order to answer this question, a variety of strategies will be used. A good starting place in determining if an activity is being implemented is to study the kind of information that was presented to the field. Therefore, data collection, analysis and improvement begin with Technical Assistance. Following every training participants receive a link to an online E-evaluations survey and an invitation to provide feedback about the training through the survey. ~~will be sent to participants. Individuals in Technical Assistance meetings as well as those who access archived broadcasts of the meetings~~

on-line also receive the link and a request to complete the survey. These surveys ask respondents to rate the effectiveness of particular aspects of the trainings, including the trainers, and always include multiple opportunities for respondents to provide written comments. These data are immediately available to will be analyzed by both consultants and the Administrator of Accreditation and have been used to identify strengths and areas in need of improvement when developing subsequent trainings.

A second perspective on the question of implementation is provided by for answering the question will come from those who completed the accreditation activity. Invitations to participate in brief evaluation. Therefore, surveys will be are sent to Program Coordinators, credential analysts, and Deans following a site visit. These surveys will ask several questions about the effectiveness of different activities that prepare institutions for a site visit, and about the team lead's and consultant's effectiveness and objectivity during the site visit. for completing a Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit and ask for elements that may need refinement or improvement. Each year, the COA will receives summary information from the site visit surveys.

Finally, focus groups will help provide an even more in-depth understanding of how each of the activities is being implemented. The focus groups will consist of the appropriate stakeholders, such as Program Coordinators, Deans, and/or Team Leads.

Does the activity provide useful information for other activities in the system, and in making accreditation decisions?

Following completion of accreditation site visits, team members and program sponsors have the opportunity to give feedback about the utility of earlier accreditation activities on the activity that was just completed. For example, site visit team members provide insight into how the Biennial Reports and Program Assessment documents and reviewer feedback supported their work during the visit. Similarly, program sponsors are asked to describe whether completing the Biennial Report and Program Assessment processes influenced their preparation for the site visit and, if so, how the influence occurred.

In 2009-2010, one cohort (Orange Cohort) will have submitted an initial Biennial Report and be submitting Program Assessment documents. Staff will share the Biennial Reports as well as the feedback with the Program Assessment readers. Readers will be asked to share if and how the Biennial Report informed their understanding of the program and the types of questions they had for the program sponsor.

Team leads and team members conducting Site Visits to Yellow Cohort institutions in 2009-2010 will be asked if and how the Preliminary Reports of Findings (Program Assessment) were useful. Results will help Program Assessment readers refine the Preliminary Reports of Findings and help staff communicate the information effectively to the Site Visit Team.

Each year as the COA makes decisions about accreditation, a debrief discussion will continue in order to understand and fine tune how information from each activity of the accreditation system informed the COA as it made its accreditation decision.

Is the activity serving the objectives of the accreditation system?

Each year the COA's Annual Report ~~will~~ to the Commission addresses the COA's Work Plan, which includes the objectives of the accreditation system: accountability, quality, standards and on-going improvement. Summary information ~~may~~ includes information about the frequency and effectiveness of:

- Activities completed by CTC staff to increase and maintain public access to the COA, including electronic newsletters, program sponsor alerts, and the website;
- Professional accreditation of institutions and their educator preparation programs, including initial program review, accreditation site visits, BIR trainings;
- Technical assistance activities, program assessment activities, the integration of additional programs into the Commission's accreditation system, and dissemination of information related to the Commission's standards; and
- Ongoing program improvement activities including biennial reports, the evaluation system for the accreditation system, and developing partnerships with national and professional accrediting organizations.
- ~~• technical assistance activities, by whom, and the stakeholder evaluations of the activities;~~
- ~~• a summary of institutions' a) responses to requests for additional information, b) responses to the COA's questions or concerns, and c) additional information or activities completed to address stipulations; and~~
- ~~• summary of focus groups or stakeholder surveys who participated in each accreditation activity. Topics to be discussed and explored will be how completion of accreditation activities supported on-going improvement, preparation of quality educators, and adherence to standards.~~

Upon completion of the first seven-year cycle, stakeholders who have been through the entire process, from Biennial Reports to Program Assessment through Site Visits, will be surveyed or interviewed to determine changes or improvements they can trace at their institution through the entire cycle and share how the accreditation activities supported the change or might be modified to better enable on-going improvement and change.

Does the accreditation system impact student learning?

A more overarching question about the accreditation system will be added for consideration as more data become available. That is "Does the accreditation system impact student learning?"

Answers to this question may come from a variety of sources. Staff could survey employers, use results of CSU surveys on teacher preparation and consider expanding the survey to include other credential preparation areas, use Cal TIDES data as in information source and use doctoral students to research questions about the system and its impact.

The charts that follow are designed for staff use and provide a comprehensive view of the entire system. Each activity of the accreditation system, Biennial Reports, Program Assessment and Site Visits is represented by a chart with the evaluation that will be completed, how it will be analyzed and to whom it will be reported. A final chart represents the overall goal of the

evaluation of the accreditation system...that is, how can one know that the accreditation system makes a difference in preparing effective educators who have a positive impact on student learning?

Biennial Report

Activity and Questions	Data Collected	Analysis	Reporting & Improvement
BR1—How well is the biennial report being implemented?	BR1.1 Feedback and evaluation from stakeholders from Technical Assistance meetings.	BR1.1 Collection of surveys and evaluations. Areas in need of improvement and areas of strength noted.	BR1.1 Changes made to Technical Assistance made to the field either in meetings, on website or by other means. Collection of data and improvement process are ongoing.
	BR1.2 Summary data	BR1.2 Number and types of programs submitted, trends, interesting findings.	BR1.2 Report to COA
	BR1.3 On-line surveys from Program Coordinators and Deans	BR1.3 Collection of information from those who completed Biennial Reports re: what was useful in completing the report, what was not, etc.	BR1.3 Report to COA and make any needed changes to instructions, webpage information, technical assistance meetings.
	BR1.4 Hold a focus group of Biennial Report completers to discuss process and elements that need improvement.	BR1.4 Staff collects responses to questions posed by staff and collected without rejoinder, identify themes	BR1.3 Report to COA
BR2—Does the Biennial Report provide useful information to the Program Assessment readers?	BR.2.1 Strategies to determine the answer to this question are under consideration and would first be implemented with Program Assessment for the Orange Cohort in 2008-2009.		
BR3—Does the Biennial Report provide helpful information to the Site Visit process and, in turn in making accreditation decisions?	BR 2.2 Strategies to determine the answer to this question are under consideration and would first be implemented with the Site Visits from the Orange Cohort in 2010-2011.		
BR4—Is the Biennial Report serving the objectives of the accreditation system?	BR3.1 Compile information from all sources noted above.	BR3.1 Staff summarizes information noting themes and trends.	BR3.1 Report to COA to be included in the Annual Report.

Program Assessment

Activity and Questions	Data Collected	Analysis	Reporting & Improvement
PA1—How well is program assessment being implemented?	PA1.1 Feedback and evaluation from stakeholders from Technical Assistance meetings.	PA1.1 Collection of surveys and evaluations. Areas in need of improvement and areas of strength noted.	PA1.1 Changes made to Technical Assistance made to the field either in meetings, on website or by other means. Collection of data and improvement process are ongoing.
	PA1.2 Summary report on documents submitted.	PA1.2 Number and types of programs and institutions, trends	PA1.2 Report to COA
	PA1.3 On-line surveys from Program Coordinators and Deans	PA1.3 Compile information from survey as to what reader comments were helpful and what they found useful in the activity.	PA1.3 Report to COA Changes in instructions, webpage information, technical assistance meetings
	PA1.4 Hold a focus group of Program Assessment completers to discuss process and elements that need improvement.	PA1.1.4. Staff collects comments, notes themes	PA1.4 Report to COA
PA2—Does Program Assessment provide helpful information to the Site Visit process and, in turn in making accreditation decisions?	PA2.1 Strategies to determine the answer to this question are under consideration and would first be implemented with the Site Visits from the Yellow Cohort in 2009-2010. They might include: Questions asked on evaluations for the institution and site team members as to how well the Preliminary Report of Findings from Program Assessment was used during the site visit		
PA3—Is Program Assessment serving the objectives of the accreditation system?	PA3.1 Compile information from all sources noted above.	PA3.1 Staff summarizes information noting themes and trends.	PA3.1 Report to COA to be included in the Annual Report.

Site Visits

Activity and Questions	Data Collected	Analysis	Reporting & Improvement
SV1—How well are site visits being implemented?	SV1.1 Feedback and evaluation from stakeholders from Technical Assistance meetings.	SV1.1 Collection of surveys and evaluations. Areas in need of improvement and areas of strength noted.	SV1.1 Changes made to Technical Assistance made to the field either in meetings, on website or by other means. Collection of data and improvement process are ongoing.
	SV1.2 Evaluation forms sent to institutional representatives, team leaders, consultant and team members with questions regarding the visit process as well as recommendations for improvement.	SV1.2 Staff to note themes in comments.	SV1.2 Report to COA and propose changes to BIR training, consultant and/or team lead training. Propose changes to information given to institutions as they prepare for the site visit.
	SV1.3 Hold meetings with Team Leaders, Consultants and COA to determine what components of the process are working (e.g., report writing, reporting to COA), and what parts are not working	SV1.3 Staff to take notes during meeting and note themes from the comments.	SV1.3 Report to COA and propose changes in instructions, webpage information, technical assistance meetings. Also propose changes to information given to institutions as they prepare for the site visit.
	SV1.4 Note how stipulations are addressed; results of re-visits and follow up activities; and changes in Biennial Reports after a site visit.	SV1.4 Staff to summarize information and note themes from the information.	SV1.4 Report to COA and summary noted in the Annual Report
SV2—Are site visits serving the objectives of the accreditation system?	SV2.1 Compile information from all sources noted above.	SV2.1 Staff summarizes information noting themes and trends.	SV2.1 Report to COA to be included in the Annual Report.

Overall Impact of the Accreditation System

Activity and Questions	Data Collected	Analysis	Reporting & Improvement
O.1—What is the overall impact of the accreditation system?	<p>O.1.1 Survey responses from programs after once through the 7 year cycle...How has the system impacted your program? What difference has it made for program completers?</p> <p>O.1.2 At several points in the cycle, select some institutions to see if changes can be tracked from biennial reports to program assessment to site visits.</p> <p>O.1.3 Call together a focus group of Deans who went through the process to talk about changes made at the institution based upon the site visit and other accreditation activities.</p>	<p>O.1.1 Staff to summarize responses. Consider problems, if any noted repeatedly, and make suggestions for change/improvement.</p> <p>O.1.2 Staff to summarize responses. Consider problems, if any noted repeatedly, and make suggestions for change/improvement.</p> <p>O.1.3 Staff to summarize information and note themes from the information.</p>	<p>O.1.1 Report to COA and propose changes to BIR training, consultant and/or team lead training. Propose changes to information given to institutions as they prepare for the site visit.</p> <p>O.1.1 Report to COA and propose changes to BIR training, consultant and/or team lead training. Propose changes to information given to institutions as they prepare for the site visit. Report summary in the Annual Report</p> <p>O.1.3 Report to COA and summary noted in the Annual Report</p>
O.2—Does the accreditation system have an impact on the preparation of teachers in California?	<p>O.2.1.1 Survey employers.</p> <p>O.2.1.2. Use results of CSU surveys on teacher preparation and consider expanding the survey to include other credential preparation areas.</p> <p>O.2.1.3 Use Cal TIDES data as in information source.</p> <p>O.2.1.4 Use doctoral students to research questions about the system and its impact.</p>	O.2 Staff summarizes information noting themes and trends.	O.2 Report to COA to be included in the Annual Report.
O.3—Does the accreditation system have an impact on student learning?	O.3.1 Data collection to be determined.	O.3.1 Analysis will be based upon the types of data collected and are to be determined.	O.3.1 Reporting and Improvement strategies to be determined based upon the types of data collected.

Accreditation Handbook Review and Adoption by the COA

Italics= Proposed Date

Bold = Adoption Date

	Reviewed by the COA		Adoption by COA
	Information	Action	
Introduction	<i>5/10</i>	<i>6/10</i>	6/10
Chapter One: Responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the Committee on Accreditation		1/10	1/10
Chapter Two: Standards in Accreditation		1/10	1/10
Chapter Three: Institutional and Program Approval		8/09	8/09
Chapter Four: The Accreditation Cycle	1/10	4/10	4/10
Chapter Five: Biennial Reports	4/10	5/10	6/10
Chapter Six: Program Assessment	4/10	5/10	6/10
Chapter Seven: Preparation for an Accreditation Site Visit			6/09
Chapter Eight: Accreditation Decision Options and Implications	8/09	10/09	10/09
Chapter Nine: Activities during the 7th Year of the Accreditation Cycle	10/09	1/10	1/10
Chapter Ten: Accreditation Site Visit Team Member Information	10/09	1/10	1/10
Chapter Eleven: BIR Member Skills and Competencies	1/10	1/10	1/10
Chapter Twelve: Team Leadership	5/10	6/10	6/10
Chapter Thirteen: Articulation between State and National Accreditation	6/10	<i>10/10</i>	<i>10/10</i>
Chapter Fourteen: Evaluation of the Accreditation System	6/10	<i>8/10</i>	<i>8/10</i>
Appendix A: Sample Reports			
Appendix B: Sample Interview Schedule			
Appendix C: Team Report Development Forms			
Appendix D: Evaluation Forms			
Appendix E: Common Standards	Adopted by the Commission		
Appendix F: Experimental Standards	Adopted by the Commission		
Appendix G: Framework	Adopted by the Commission		